

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE  
WESTERN DIVISION**

---

CHRIS MORRIS,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	No. 2:25-cv-02229-TLP-tmp
v.	)	
	)	
TENNESSEE FARMERS MUTUAL	)	
INSURANCE COMPANY, JEREMY	)	
BIGGS, and UNITED STATES,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

---

**ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

---

Pro se Plaintiff Chris Morris sued Tiffany Biggs, Tennessee Farmers Mutual Insurance Company, and Jeremy Biggs in Lauderdale County General Sessions, over an alleged motor vehicle accident involving an employee of the United States Postal Service. (ECF Nos. 1, 1-2.) The United States removed the case to this Court in February 2025. (ECF No. 1.) And under Administrative Order No. 2013-05, the Court referred the case to Chief Magistrate Judge Tu M. Pham (“Judge Pham”) for management of all pretrial matters.

In February 2025, the United States moved to substitute itself as the Defendant in place of Tiffany Biggs. (ECF No. 6.) The Court granted that Motion in May 2025. (ECF No. 13.) Defendants Tennessee Farmers Mutual Insurance Company, Jeremy Biggs, and the United States now each move to dismiss this action. (ECF Nos. 11, 12, 14.) Plaintiff has not responded to any of the three motions, despite Judge Pham having entered show cause orders directing him to do so. (ECF Nos. 15, 16.)

In June 2025, Judge Pham entered a report and recommendation (“R&R”) in this matter suggesting this Court dismiss Plaintiff’s Complaint with prejudice for failure to prosecute. (ECF No. 17.) For the reasons below, the Court **ADOPTS** the R&R.

### **LEGAL STANDARD**

A magistrate judge may submit to a district court judge proposed findings of fact and recommendations for deciding pretrial matters. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A)–(B). And “[w]ithin 14 days after being served with a copy of the recommended disposition, a party may serve and file specific written objections to the proposed findings and recommendations.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2); *see also* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). If the parties do not object, the district court reviews the R&R for clear error. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b) advisory committee notes. And the district court “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). Judge Pham entered his R&R in June 2025. Neither party objected, and the time to do so has now passed. The Court therefore reviews the R&R for clear error.

### **DISPOSITION**

Having reviewed the record, the Court finds no clear error in Judge Pham’s R&R. In fact, the Court agrees with his analysis. Indeed, Plaintiff has failed to respond to any of the three pending motions to dismiss and has twice failed to comply with Judge Pham’s show cause orders. Plus, Judge Pham warned Plaintiff that his Complaint would be dismissed with prejudice for failure to prosecute if he failed to respond to the pending motions. (ECF Nos. 15, 16.)

As a result, the Court agrees with Judge Pham that the case should be dismissed for failure to prosecute. Accordingly, the Court **ADOPTS** the R&R and **DISMISSES** this case

**WITH PREJUDICE.** And the Court **DENIES** as **MOOT** the pending motions to dismiss (ECF Nos. 11, 12, 14).

**SO ORDERED**, this 28th day of July, 2025.

s/Thomas L. Parker  
THOMAS L. PARKER  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE